THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. III. APRIL, 1923. No. 4.

The International Scapegoat.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

A view, rare in our bigotry-ridden and fanatical times, is propounded in the *Kristeligt Dagblad* of Kopenhagen (July 27, 1922) regarding the Jews. In an effort to apportion fairly the responsibility for the intolerable state of affairs which is distressing and perplexing the nations of the earth, a writer who signs himself E. C., offers for general consideration the following thoughts: —

Nearly everywhere in the world the bush (Ex. 2, 2) is blazing brightly: the blaze of anti-Semitism, or hatred of the Jews, is spreading and rising in ever higher and wilder flames around the Jewish people. In Germany anti-Semitism is burning everywhere, and the concealed fire blazed forth in the murder of the Jew Rathenau. In Russia the Soviet, spite of its Jewish leaders, has not been able to prevent the medieval pogroms, which during the last year have cost 150,000 Jews their lives, and all Jews and friends of the Jews are trembling with fear at the thought of what is going to happen to the Jewish masses in Russia when finally the Jew Trotzky will be overthrown. For if the slogan in 1905 was: Extinguish the revolution with the blood of the Jews! will the coming slogan not be: Drown Bolshevism in Jewish blood? In free America, where within a generation 2,500,000 Jewish fugitives have been granted asylum, hatred of the Jews is gathering ever-increasing force, just as in all those countries where the Jews are rapidly growing in numbers. It is no better in England. Even here in our home country in the North [Denmark], where Jews are among the most respected citizens, "the mountain-climbers on the Mont Blanc of toleration" are ever becoming fewer. Professor Roznieckí, who died recently, is certainly correct when, in his excellent book *The Jewish Problem,* he writes: "Suppose, now, that Kopenhagen were to shelter as many Jews as Warsaw, — that means in proportion to the number of its in-

habitants about 250,000, — these 250,000 Yiddish-speaking Jews, most of them demanding self-government as a nation, would give the Kopenhageners a chance to make use of a favorable opportunity for practising patience in exceptional measure. But it is doubtful whether they would really stand the test, judging from the opposition which during the years of the late war was roused among us by the 'invasion of foreigners,' that is, by a few hundreds of Polish and Russian Jews who entered our country, most of them constituting indeed an undesirable element."

If the question, now, is raised: What may be the principal reason for this outburst of hatred of the Jews? the answer might be ventured: The people must have a scapegoat. The history of centuries teaches us that every time the people of Europe were in bad straits, — after a crushing defeat, state banktruptcy, and the like, — the Jews living in the country were, rightfully or wrongfully, held responsible for the disaster. People demanded an atoning sacrifice, a scapegoat. That is what is happening now. We are far from holding that the Jewish people are a worthy atoning sacrifice, that is, that they are without guilt. It is a sad fact that the 14,000,000 Jews now living, who constitute barely one per cent. of the population of the world, have always exerted, and are still exerting, an altogether disproportionate and, quite frequently, a harmful influence, especially on commerce, the press, politics, the banks, and the exchanges. They are not suffering as an innocent lamb, but *dumb* as a lamb they are led to the slaughter. This everybody will say who has seen a Jewish pogrom with his own eyes. No matter how much the Jewish press may cry out against the persecution of the Jews, the harassed and reviled, sacked and mistreated Jews themselves are *silent* before their violators — silent in the dignity of suffering.

Without guilt this scapegoat is not, but are we non-Jews without guilt? Anti-Semites have tried to put not only the chief blame, but all blame, on the Jews, and to trace every misfortune to them. What shallow thinking there is involved in this view a few of the main thoughts of a recent lecture by the Director of the *Berliner Israelsmission,* Pastor E. Schaeffer, may serve to show. Among missionaries to the Jews Schaeffer passes for an anti-Semite; his judgment therefore, if favorable to the Jews, may be regarded as impartial. He points out four leading thoughts in the modern anti-Semitic literature of Germany.

1. In a political and national, religious and moral respect the Jews act as a dissolvent among any people. — But, says Schaeffer,

replying to this charge, how is it possible that among a people that has since times immemorial been accorded the glory and honor of being loyal and truth-loving, *one* per cent. of Jews can bring about a confusion as complete as the one in which we find ourselves at present? Can fungi thrive in a soil that is not suited for them?

2. The Jews are an "inferior race." The Arian races are like the resplendent Baldur who becomes the victim of the slanderous and blind Hoedur. — Yes, says Schaeffer, it is an old race, and this inferior race baffles all attempts that are made to improve it. But have we of the Arian stock in Europe furnished convincing proofs during the World War that *our* race is of superior quality?

3. The Jews' "Asiatic working methods" have devastated our entire economic life. They have invented their peculiar credit, exchange, loan, and rent business, in a word, capitalism, which regards money not merely as a medium of exchange, but as a valuable asset in itself. By this means they have, as an international society of robbers, exercised their rule of violence and terror in the world, which they actually hold in their hands, as every one can feel, so that they are in a position to decide questions of peace or war in a nation, and can arbitrarily, guided exclusively by their financial interests, determine the rise and fall of prices. — But, queries Schaeffer, would our modern industrial life not become simply impossible without these media in the world of credits and finance? And were these means not regarded as a good article while commerce was in a flourishing condition?

4. The morals and religion of the Jews reveal them as an inferior race. In the Talmud, in which the post-Christian teaching of Judaism has been deposited, there is taught a double standard of morality, one for dealing with a Jew, another for dealing with a non-Jew. — In his reply to this argument Schaeffer undervalues the present influence of Talmudic teaching on the Jews. He declares that anti-Semites disregard all scientific development, which clearly shows that the Talmud "is not a book of doctrine, but a protocol of discussions among rabbis concerning their much-controverted explanations of the Law of Moses." The mere fact that not long ago an English translation of the Babylonian Talmud was published in New York would seem to indicate that the Jews are still studying the Talmud and are making it accessible to those of their race who are no longer conversant with the language of the Talmud. Hence they put a far higher value on it than Schaeffer. But Schaeffer is right in pointing out that to anti-

Semites not even the Old Testament is sacred. Prof. Frederick Delitzsch, the anti-Semitic son of the well-known friend of the Jews, Prof. Francis Delitzsch, in his treatise *The Great Deception* has made an attempt to dismember the Bible of the Jews, the Old Testament, and to show that Israel's Jahve, or Jehovah, is not the almighty, holy, and eternal God, whom Christ worshiped and proclaimed as His Father, but a tribal god, in whom the small Israelitic tribe has personified and honored its own disgraceful characteristics. The conquest of Canaan is not to be ascribed to the wonderful and gracious help of God, but is to be regarded as a vulgar act of violence, executed with awful cruelty and rendered possible by the treason of an Israelitic whore. The prophets are said to have been narrow-minded fanatics. The teaching that Israel is the chosen race is declared to be merely a cunning trick for concealing the selfishness and avarice of the Israelites, and the phrase was invented to vindicate the attacks of the Israelites on the gods and the treasures of other peoples. Even the Psalms of David are of inferior value, etc.

All these unproved and unchristian claims are seized like warm bread by the uncritical and dechristianized masses of the people. At the same time an effort is being made to reintroduce the old German belief in Wodan,* hence, to worship the hoary German tribal or folk-god of primitive times!

Now, these anti-Semitic claims, by their whole spirit and character, are sufficient proof that the Jewish people are neither the chief nor the only cause of the political, economic, and religio-moral misery of our time. That Jews have had quite a considerable share in bringing about these conditions cannot and must not be denied, but to lodge the blame for all these things with *the* Jews, that is, the Jewish people, would be just as one-sided and unfair as to call all saints hypocrites on account of one Judas, or to dub all Grundtvigian young people's societies dancing-clubs because of the fact that some of them have danced. Especially as Christians, and particularly in reference to the Jews, we should be careful not to generalize, to make overstatements, and to measure all of them by the same yardstick, as is generally done by agitators in our time. That is neither true, fair, nor charitable, and the object aimed at — the suppression or conversion of the Jews — is by no means attained in that way. The bush is either consumed or transformed.

In a well-known and widely disseminated mission-tract Pro-

---

* See Julius Bode's *Wodan und Jesus*, [1920].

fessor Dalman, of Jerusalem, addresses the Jews, not as the Catholics do: *"Ye* have crucified Jesus," but in this wise: *"We* have crucified Jesus, we of heathen descent and you of the house of Israel." For, surely, both the Jew Caiaphas and the heathen Pilate, both the Jewish mob and the Roman soldiers reviled and tortured and crucified Him. This applies likewise to all the ungodliness, denial of Christ, sin, and misery of our own time. *We* — Christians as well as Jews — must learn to confess before God and one another: *We* have sinned. *We* have denied and dishonored Christ. *We* are the scapegoat that is tortured and plagued, not, however, for some one else's sins, but each one of us for his own misdoings. This self-knowledge and confession of sin is the first step on the way toward the healing of the nation and their salvation, toward the extinction of the wild flames of hatred and the transforming of the thorn-bush.

To the comment already woven into the above review the following reflections might be added.

1. The argument that the great power of the Jews is disproportionate to their small number and for that reason is to be discounted, if not discredited, is feeble. We remember what is said about the leavening power of even a little leaven. Gal. 5, 9. Great disasters, like an avalanche, may have tiny beginnings. Evil tendencies, especially if they appeal to greed and become profitable, easily gain converts and associates. And greed, while it is by no means restricted to the Jews, is a pronounced characteristic of their race.

2. The Jews are inveterate millenarians. The dream of world-dominion is ever obsessing them, being still fed by false interpretations of the Old Testament, as it was in the days of our Lord. (Augsb. Conf., Art. 17, 5.)

3. If the offense of some Jews is not to be charged to the Jewish race, it is to be hoped that there are Danes who are willing to apply the same rule to the German people. For neither are all Germans Nietzsches and Haeckels and Frederick Delitzsches, *et id omne genus.*

4. The idea of the scapegoat is a fruitful subject for meditation anywhere and at any time. Also in the United States there is lively hunting for scapegoats. There is always an open season for scapegoats, and the guilty conscience is a mighty Nimrod.

5. Individual guilt is easily turned into corporate guilt. We earned that lesson, too, during the late war.

A Bit of Recent Swedish Church History.

Prof. W. H. T. Dau, St. Louis, Mo.

43. A Division among the Mission-Friends.

It is quite evident that a doctrinal controversy of the dimensions and importance of the one sketched in the foregoing chapters must have its effect and bring about a division not only at the conferences of *Stiftelsen,* but also among the congregations that had joined and were working together with E. F. S. Accordingly, serious frictions occurred here and there throughout Sweden. Unless the helm of the ship was taken from the directors of E. F. S., all signs pointed to a season of sifting for its followers, similar to that which followed upon the Waldenstroem controversy when old friends became forever separated. But it seemed as if the directors of Stiftelsen would not or could not see the extent of the danger, and they did nothing to change their course, but instead thereof they cooperated with several of their members in giving the signal for forcing asunder the various groups of mission-friends.

The signal was given, and the first bugle-blast winded in the Evangelical Lutheran Mission Congregation at Stockholm. In this congregation there existed a great opposition. The editor of *Nya Vaektaren,* Axel B. Svensson, had for some years served as the first preacher of this congregation. In the congregation's directorate there sat members both of *Stiftelsen's* and of B. V.'s directorate. Efforts had been made for a long time to induce Svensson either to give up the fight against the Kolmodinian ideas or to resign. But no attempt had been made to state the latter alternative publicly, because no objection could be raised to Svensson's teaching and life, and as a preacher he was well liked. However, by a skilful maneuver his opponents had succeeded already at the annual meeting in 1910 in putting into the directorate of the congregation another *Stiftelsen* man, Director K. J. Ahlberg, who even became the president of the congregation. Although Ahlberg's election to the church council of the congregation certainly had a bearing on the development of matters, still the work of undermining Svensson was chiefly performed by two other members of the directorate. Together with the second preacher of the congregation they were busy bringing into the congregation as members quite a number of persons who were declared followers of the new course of *Stiftelsen.*

However, it was not until January, 1911, that serious complications arose. Through an agitation that had been started there

had been delivered to the quarterly meeting of the congregation a letter in which the demand was made that Svensson should cease publishing *Nya Vaektaren* and resign as secretary and member of the directorate of B. V. The quarterly meeting under protest of a strong minority passed in a somewhat modified form a resolution in harmony with the above letter, and Svensson was asked to make answer to this resolution of the congregation within two months.

It is plain that Svensson could not, without becoming unfaithful to the truth and to the charge which God had assigned him, comply with this request of the congregation. He returned an elaborate answer to the congregation, in which he gave an account of the origin and import of the Kolmodin controversy, and wound up by putting the question to the congregation whether he should continue the fight against Bible criticism and remain in the directorate of the B. V. of E. F. S. If the congregation refused to grant him these two points, they were asked to regard his letter as a request for his dismissal.

This letter which was given to the members of the congregation in printed form, together with the opinion of the church council, was discussed at the annual meeting on April 10. On the same occasion a document, drawn up by 115 members of the congregation, was presented, in which Svensson was given most extensive testimonials. After a stormy debate lasting several hours the congregation, with a majority of 55 votes, resolved, without answering the question addressed to it by Svensson, to grant him the desired dismissal. But this did not by any means conclude the affair.

44. Organization of the Rosenius Congregation at Stockholm.

The minority members of the congregation represented its real kernel. They were the support of the congregation and took an active part in its activities. It was easily foreseen that they would not be satisfied with the resolution that had been passed. Under the leadership of business manager S. E. Hemberg, painter A. F. Hallberg, and others, these friends on April 21 organized Rosenius Congregation at Stockholm, promptly secured a place for conducting services, and called Svensson as their preacher.

The outcome of this strife in Stockholm naturally caused a moral effect even in the rural places. On the part of *Stiftelsen* it amounted to a preparatory step for the coming conference, in-

dicating a determination to terrorize the B. V. and vote them down. However, this aim was not achieved without direct opposition, for the determination and energetic action of the friends in Stockholm inspired many who were despondent with new hope.

45. The Conference of 1911.

Meanwhile the conference drew near. It was plain to all that the last and decisive blow was about to be struck. The conference was to render a decision on a resolution embodying an amendment to *Stiftelsen's* constitution. This amendment aimed at excluding the B. V. from E. F. S. The directors supported this resolution. But a number of burning questions arose, the principal one being the withdrawal of Enok Hedberg and in consequence of that the withdrawal of the Director of Missions, Pastor J. Lindgren. On account of these and several other issues the conference of E. F. S. in 1911 was in interested circles looked forward to with equally tense expectation as its last predecessors.

On the day before the conference several of the clerical district representatives held a separate meeting at which a resolution was passed, amongst other things, to secure Pastor Lindgren's restoration and to stick to the resolution of the conference of 1909. Even at this gathering there was dissatisfaction with the directors, who had plainly forfeited to a great extent people's respect and confidence. Nor could the directors go to the meeting of conference with anything like light hearts: In church and secular papers they had been asked to resign, and quite unanimously they had been declared incapable of holding their office. It was plain that, if they wished to retain their office, they must hold themselves ready to make concessions at some points. They had to choose between the B. V. and the declared Kolmodinians. As we shall see, they chose to bow to the latter.

Already when the question of their discharge was up, the directors were fiercely attacked by the friends and supporters of Pastor Lindgren. The fact was now revealed that for several years the financial condition of *Stiftelsen* had become so bad that the society's capital had been diminished by nearly 300,000 kroner. This charge of a default of the most serious nature was not the only one. Especially sharp rejoinders were made when the withdrawal of the Director of Missions came up for debate. The directors had the floor, and according to the unanimous reports of the transactions of the conference in the newspapers they stated as a reason amongst others why Pastor Lindgren had withdrawn, that in *Stiftelsen* there were

men so narrow-minded as to demand that the Bible must be regarded as infallible, and the directors had allowed their regard for these men to dictate several of their resolutions, for instance, the hearing of Enok Hedberg. Although the discussion pointed to a very tense situation, the directors were given their discharge without a vote being taken.

When the discussion was taken up in the afternoon on the amendment to the constitution, Pastor Montelius opened the debate and warmly advocated the change. After a long debate the resolution to amend was adopted, and a clause was added besides, which declared expressly that at future conferences of *Stiftelsen* no director or preacher and no member of B. V. should have a seat or vote.

Two years before the annual conference of E. F. S. had abandoned the first fundamental principle of the Reformation and had expressed its confidence in a position which set up reason as judge over the Bible. Now the conference in cold blood excommunicated a large group of mission-friends for the sole reason that this group would not approve nor cease opposing the unhappy resolution of the year 1909. The conference did not take into consideration that these excommunicated members had — some of them from the very beginning — supported with willing hands the inner and especially the foreign mission of E. F. S. To this mission they had a better right than the loud-talking, tumultuous majority, which had deceitfully changed the old policy of E. F. S. A feeling of belated sorrow was hovering over the conference, while the leading men of B. V. were saying their farewell to an organization which once upon a time had rightly been called *Evangeliska Fosterlands-Stiftelsen.* The President of *Bibeltrogna Vaenner,* Lambert Jepsson, asked permission, since this was the last time that he took part in a conference of *Stiftelsen,* to speak a few words of farewell. He said that he was a friend of showing one's colors plainly, and this had just been done. The result of the election of directors showed clearly enough the course which E. F. S. was steering. The speaker said that for many years he had loved *Stiftelsen* and worked for it, but now he and all the rest of the *Bibeltrogna Vaenner* had been cast out. To the last he had hoped that *Stiftelsen* would see its error and repent, but no. The error had just been ratified, and the Bible critics were triumphing.

The truth of these words became manifest immediately, for before the close of the conference a resolution was passed by a large

majority to invite Pastor J. Lindgren to withdraw his resignation and remain as director of *Stiftelsen's* foreign mission. As *Nya Vaektaren* put it, "the cap-stone was thus laid for the new building: a *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen* with moderate tendencies toward Bible criticism."

46. After the Conference.

The time after the conference within *Stiftelsen* was taken up with negotiations with Pastor Lindgren. From a practical viewpoint, the directors had to surrender their position at nearly every point. The confessional question involved was solved by the directors declaring that they could make no definite statement regarding the inspiration of the Bible, since nothing is found in the confessional writings that comes near expressing the sense of the directors.

The controversy in *Stiftelsen* had thus been practically brought to a conclusion. True, individuals were found and are still found in this society who did not, and still do not, approve the Kolmodinian Bible criticism. But no *real* opposition to modern innovations may be expected from these persons. As a rule, it is these persons who are waiting to do something until it is too late. And the warriors, who are waiting to draw their swords until the entire first army is overthrown and conquered, usually end by becoming lackeys to the enemy.

47. Missionsaelskapet B. V.

The mission-friends who had been excommunicated by the conference of *Stiftelsen* met Saturday, July 17, for private deliberation. The burning question with them was what they must now do. Through the resolution of *Stiftelsen's* conference it was no longer possible for them to continue as a society *within Stiftelsen.* Either they had to separate and each go his own way, or if they wished to continue their work, it had to be done in a different manner than heretofore. No one entertained any thought of dissolution and separation. They had come together from widely separated parts of the country; most of them had learned to know each other at conferences of *Stiftelsen,* and they had been drawn together more closely during their three years' war in behalf of Holy Scripture. A bond of friendship had thus been formed among them for life that was not to be disrupted like so many similar ties. However, it was not personal friendship only that now held them together, but the love of Christ, which constrains men to engage in mission-work. And so it came to pass that in the afternoon of

June 17, 1911, the *Missionsaelskapet Bibeltrogna Vaenner* (Mission Society of Bible-believing Friends) was organized in the church of the Rosenius Congregation on *Smala graend* (Narrow Street, or Court). However, it was not a new organization that came into existence, but it was the society of *E. F. S.'s Bibeltrogna Vaenner,* which now resolved to expand its membership and work into an independent mission society. Accordingly, the old directors continued in office. But the constitution was subjected to a necessary revision, and district representatives were appointed. As once upon a time E. F. S. had been organized in reliance upon God, who also protected them graciously as long as they clung to His Word, so a remnant of the old *Stiftelsen* now united in reliance upon their father's God and the Word of that God.

48. Activities of the B. V.

It was not long before it was manifest that the Lord remembered especially and cared for the excommunicated, as He has always done. The work grew and gained a great following in the rural districts, so that quite a number of laborers had to be called. Amongst others public school teacher P. Hulthén, who took active part in the fight against Bible criticism, was appointed field secretary. Many mission-congregations severed their connection with E. F. S. and joined B. V., and in other places new congregations were organized. This happened, for instance, at Karlskrona, where the *Stiftelsen* people closed their mission-house to the preachers of B. V.

While the work thus grew and progressed in the homeland, foreign mission-work was as yet only the subject of prayer. In principle the taking up of mission-work among the heathen had already been resolved upon, but no one had any idea where the field might be located which the Lord would assign to the B. V. Moreover, for many, yea, for most of the members of B. V. it was impossible to forget their old mission in East Africa, which had become greatly endeared to them. They felt a great yearning for this work when they realized that they could no longer regard the mission in Abyssinia and Gallia, that had been baptized with blood and tears, as their own. They had taken part in the tearful sowing, and now they were not to take part in the joyful reaping.

The directors of B. V. were quiet and called upon the Lord to point the way. Considerable thought had been directed to a certain field, but it was shown to be incorrect. Then the Lord's answer came, and He gave more than had been asked. As the B. V. had

held fast the old faith in God's Word, the Lord now showed that these friends were to continue their work on their old mission-field in Abyssinia and Gallia. The glad tidings came in the form of a letter from one of the missionaries of E. F. S. in Abyssinia to the President of the B. V. It was Medical Missionary Karl Nystroem in Bellesa, who wrote that he felt that he was so completely one with the B. V. that he would not and could not remain any longer in the service of E. F. S., if the regime which had lately dictated the resolution of excommunication were to be continued. He had no personal complaints to make, but expressed merely the wish that in reliance upon the Lord he might labor on as a "free missionary."

Here was a plain indication from the Lord. None of the members of B. V. had exerted the least influence on Nystroem, and now, as will readily be understood, his letter came as a glad surprise.

Before the directors had come together, another letter arrived from Africa. It came from a native Abyssinian, Pastor Marcus Germei, who had received his training in Sweden and belonged to the E. F. S. mission since 1871. He propounded a twofold question: 1. whether the B. V. intended to take up mission-work in Abyssinia; 2. if so, whether he and his wife might enter the service of the B. V. While Missionary Nystroem had nothing to say about the treatment he had received from E. F. S., Pastor Germei had a long tale of suffering to relate. He had been subjected to manifold chicaneries at the hands of certain of the European missionaries of *Stiftelsen,* for which little or no cause was shown. Moreover, during the course of the year a system of favoritism had developed, of which Pastor Germei now became a victim and was altogether unjustly sentenced to a three months' suspension from his pastoral office. In vain he had laid his case before the directors of E. F. S., who turned a deaf ear to his complaints and confirmed his suspension.

When the directors of B. V. met in September, these two letters, together with the transactions in the case of Pastor Germei, were laid before them. After the director had made certain that no moral charge was lodged against Pastor Germei and that he had upon the whole been entirely innocent during his many sufferings, they resolved to call not only Missionary Nystroem, but also Pastor Germei as missionaries of the B. V. in Abyssinia. Both accepted their call and asked to be discharged from the service of E. F. S.

Thus the Lord had shown that He did not approve of the attempt of the conference of *Stiftelsen* to exclude the B. V. from

participation in the old jointly conducted mission. As they had taken part in the work under difficulties and opposition while the splendid Abyssinian highland was closed to Europeans and Protestant missionaries, the Lord wanted them also to share in the work now that the country was opened up to the Gospel.

49. Retrospect.

We have briefly sketched the sorrowful history of a grievous split among Christian confessors. Before we lay aside our pen, it remains to answer a few questions and to take a brief survey of the battle-field, on which so much is lying in dust and debris.

First comes the question: Who must be held responsible for the split? For many this question is difficult to answer, but if we permit God's Word to speak, the answer is easy. God's Word teaches distinctly that those who come forward with new doctrines conflicting with God's Word are causing schisms. Next, those are responsible who favored the spread of the new teaching of Bible criticism; and lastly, all those are responsible too who did not take part in the fight against error, but loved peace more than the truth.

When we look back and seek for the hidden causes of the fall of *Fosterlands-Stiftelsen,* it is plain that it did not first begin in the years 1908 and 1909. Those years, especially the last, when the first fundamental principle of the Reformation was abandoned, only denote the conclusion of a long development. We shall have to look for the roots of this trouble as far back as the Rudin controversy. It is rather a mere accident that Professor Kolmodin was one of Rudin's disciples. Furthermore, we must bear in mind that Kolmodin year after year inculcated his views upon his students at Johannelund, without the mission-friends having any inkling of it. Accordingly, when these views were ready to blossom forth and form fruit, the ground was well prepared for them, and if we look into the matter deeply enough, there is really no reason why we should wonder that things happened as they did happen. After such a beginning it had to come thus. Gradually there had crept into *Stiftelsen* a spirit which caused the directors when calling district representatives, and conference when electing members of the directorate, to have greater regard for a person's name, social standing, and wealth than was fortunate, right, and good. And it is a matter of frequent experience that where human greatness enters in, there the greatness of God passes out, and then a fall must soon occur.

As stated before, the controversy is now practically concluded,

and it ought to furnish reason enough to all concerned for confessing their sins. It happens often that, when men fight for the truth, they lose the quality of peacemakers, which is a distinct mark of the children of God. But it is just as easy, if not easier to run into the danger of losing the truth, if in war times men try to be at peace with all parties. Yes, indeed, there is plenty of reason for confessing our sins.

On both sides a carnal spirit has cropped out on many occasions, and oftentimes judgments have been handed down that were unnecessarily hard. But one need not be astonished at this, for men are a frail generation, and sin is ever besetting them. Thus many tactical mistakes have been made also by the *Bibeltrogna,* chiefly this one, that they hesitated for a long time to unite in an organization of their own within *Stiftelsen.* As was pointed out before, this should have been done already in the year 1909. The reason why it was not done was, of course, that men had not yet lost all hope that the directors of *Stiftelsen* were able and willing to guide everything to a right conclusion. For this reason all measures which might be interpreted as a direct disapproval of the directors were delayed to the utmost. This shows that it was not lust of power or, as has been said, a desire to obtain a domineering position within E. F. S. that forced the decision. But that can be altered as little as some other things. However, the account is squared somewhat in that there was at last a union of the congenial elements. In many quarters the name of *E. F. S.'s Bibeltrogna Vaenner* has been criticized, but this name was certainly of great importance. Still, we do not see such great importance in the circumstance which was stressed by B. V.'s own men, and that is this, that the name should serve as a marker of a union on the best traditions of old *Stiftelsen,* and as a right to inherit the same. For us the importance of the name lies in the fact that it could bring out, as it did, the true mind of the directors of *Stiftelsen* on the issue of war and peace. When the issue was the authority of the Bible, the directors were not willing to fight, but exhorted, all and sundry, unto peace; but when the issue was the name of E. F. S.'s B. V., those same directors put on their coats of mail and started a long and exhausting campaign against that name, although God's Word, which bids us fight for the Word and for faith, distinctly forbids fighting about words and names.

If we look about us in our beloved fatherland and hear of conditions in the small mission-congregations, we find that a deplorable disintegration is taking place in many localities. In many

places the state of affairs is this, that the mission-friends are in a state of spiritual dependence upon, and in a relation of minors to, their pastors and preachers, of whom many have from conviction embraced the Kolmodinian ideas, while many others, who are economically dependent upon the directors of *Stiftelsen,* are doing the same thing for other reasons. This causes the majority of the mission-friends throughout the country to maintain a crooked attitude towards the mooted question. The reason for this has partly been and still is because the people have no conception of what the issue is about. If this treatise should open the eyes of some, the author would regard that as an abundant reward of his labor.

However, there are wide districts in Sweden in which conditions are entirely different. Entire provinces there are where the importance of the issue is fully perceived, and men have avowedly taken the side of the B. V. It may even be said that in every locality and in every place there are found some who hold fast the old faith and do not follow *Stiftelsen* in its adventurous departures on new and untrodden paths. These friends, who stand alone in their respective places, deserve a special chapter. What this strife has cost them, what anxieties and sufferings they have undergone, nobody understands better than those who have passed through the experience themselves. But neither do the inexperienced know how they have been made aware of the Savior's sweet presence with them, when He has refreshed them with His Word, which abideth forever.

Amid the destruction and carnage on the battle-field let us bend our knees. Let us confess our sins and accept our sentence. But, on the other hand, let us not forget to give thanks. For there are also inducements to gratitude. Chiefly let us thank the Lord because He has graciously kept us from being drawn into error's mazes. Let us also try to get a clear view of the state of affairs that would ensue if there were no one to fight against error. How would things look if the error of Bible criticism were to go uncontradicted and could quietly continue to poison men's minds and souls? What would happen if the *Bibeltrogna Vaenner* were no more? Their organization has without question been of great importance as a preventive. Many errors and many bold utterances against the faith have never come out into the open because the respective parties have been afraid of the opinion which the controversy in *Stiftelsen* has actually shaped throughout Sweden. For all this we must thank the Lord; "for He is good, and His mercy endureth forever."

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

A conference for the purpose of a doctrinal discussion took place at St. James Hotel in Ironwood, Mich., on February 20. The conferees were President K. E. Salonen and Rev. G. A. Aho, representing the Finnish National Church, and President H. Daib, Rev. A. Lucas, Rev. O. Hattstaedt, and Rev. A. G. Sommer, representing the Missouri Synod. The Finnish paper *Auttaja,* published at Ironwood, briefly notes this meeting in its issue for February 22, and records the cordial spirit in which it was conducted. In its issue for March 1 the same paper, under the caption "An Important Conference," says the following: "The last annual meeting at Lehtijaervi authorized the directors of the National Church to deliberate on a union with the Missouri Synod. . . . This deliberation took place February 20. . . . We submit a general account of the results of the conference. As regards doctrine, the position of the Missouri Synod is genuinely Biblical and strictly Lutheran. Accordingly, we found ourselves easily in agreement in this respect. The leading doctrines were discussed in broad outlines, and we discovered that we occupy the same position. The Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions united us. — We are also fairly agreed in the matter of church-polity (*Praxis*). Our ideals were the same; there were difficulties on either side as regards the realization of the ideals." — These meetings are to be continued for the purpose of finding the most practical way toward bringing about a union of the Finnish National Church with the Missouri Synod. *Auttaja* urges its readers to discuss this issue publicly. D.

American Lutheran theologians to whose lot it falls to render advice in the reconstruction of the former German *Landeskirchen* will certainly be expected not to renounce principles and ideals in Germany which they maintain in America. While a certain latitude must be allowed to the reorganizers of the Church in Germany, which will enable them to take charge of vested rights and appurtenances, of time-honored, perhaps legalized customs; moreover, while admitting that the external form of a church organization is not of the essence of the Church, still any organization which reproduces the intolerable conditions of the former *Landeskirche* should be denounced. The new *Volkskirche* is simply the old *Landeskirche* under another name. In a review of Dr. Schneider's *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* Dr. Reu says in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for March: "We occupy an ecclesiastical standpoint different from that of Schneider. For, although he is numbered with the adherents to the old Gospel, he champions nevertheless the idea of the present *Volkskirche,* however, in a sounder manner than is frequently done. As for us, we cherish the conviction that only a *Bekenntniskirche* (confessing or confessional Church) — to use, for once, the German terminology — deserves the Biblical name of Church, and for this reason the ecclesiastical development in the old fatherland must energetically forge ahead toward a genuine *Freikirche* (free church) — a *Freikirche* which should indeed never

segregate itself from the "people," but, operating from its clear position and not loaded down with all the millions of dead church-members who are united only by their baptismal certificate and their receipt for church taxes with what is truly the Church, should struggle to win these poor souls for Christ and His kingdom." If the Church in Germany is to be truly a *Bekenntniskirche,* a separation is unavoidable, just as in America. This separation in no wise abrogates or limits the mission of the Church. The very separation is one of the most effective and fruitful missionary acts which the Church can perform under the circumstances. The Lord takes care of those who obey His charge: "Be ye separate!" If a Church fails in this duty of separating where separation is a plain duty, all its frenzied mission-endeavors and eager efforts to retain its hold on the "people" (and their pocketbooks?) will lead nowhere. We have learned some things in this respect here in America, of which very many good people in Germany are ignorant. Let us all help them to see things as we have long seen them, and as they should have seen them long ago. D.

Present-Day Novels and the Orthodox Church.—On this subject the *Watchman-Examiner,* February 22, 1923, writes: "Even literary men of marked ability have become the traducers of the Church. . . . It is our candid belief that there never has been a Baptist Church or such a Baptist minister as Sinclair Lewis describes in *Main Street.* If there is such a minister, we have never met him, and we perhaps know as many Baptist ministers of all varieties as any one living. Now Mrs. Helen R. Martin takes up the cudgels in her new story, *The Church on the Avenue,* published by Dodd, Mead & Co. Mrs. Martin is a clever writer, and her charming stories of the Pennsylvania Dutch, some of whom appear in this new book, have given her a well-deserved popularity. In this book she joins the ever-growing army of those who are making war on a condition of things in the Church that really does not exist, or that exists so rarely as to prove that it is exotic rather than indigenous to the Christian soil. . . . Robert Watts, the young Presbyterian pastor of 'The Church on the Avenue,' is orthodox to the core, but utterly under the thumb of Jacob Leiter, the rich man of the church and the very incarnation of littleness, meanness, and cruelty. When his rich parishioner says, 'Thumbs up!' up go the thumbs of Pastor Watts, and in excusing and explaining his subserviency and cowardice he makes one despise both his conservatism and orthodoxy. Pastor Watts refuses to lift his voice for any kind of reform and agrees to let the devil hold high carnival in his town because his salary is paid by Jacob Leiter, who is at once the devil's chief lieutenant and the leading man of 'The Church on the Avenue.' Rev. Clement Colloway, the rector of the Episcopal church at Leitersville, makes no claim to extraordinary orthodoxy, and on all social questions he is frankly a radical. He identifies himself with the people; he bears their burdens; he pleads their cause. He despises not only the big Jacob Leiter in the Presbyterian church, but all the little Jacob Leiters in his own church. But while standing for God and humanity and winning the respect

and affection of the whole town, he is bitterly persecuted by 'the money power' and at last loses his church. On the other hand, the cowardly, but orthodox Mr. Watts, while losing his own self-respect, wins a call to a great New York City church. There he will continue to preach on 'orthodoxy,' which will win the applause of the selfish rich, because it has no bearing on the practical affairs of life. Ministers like Robert Watts may exist, because in all callings there are compromisers, time-servers, and cowards. We hold no brief for ministers of that kind. Indeed, we should like to see every one of them drummed out. But the curious thing about this Rev. Robert Watts is that he was sincere and conscientious in his subserviency to the plutocrats and in his non-participation in the practical affairs of the every-day life of the people whose shepherd he was supposed to be. This book, by the clever identification of the cowardly, cloistered, conscientious, orthodox preacher with the doctrinal system that produced him, holds up to ridicule the old-fashioned, conservative theological attitude. By the clever identification of the big-hearted, unselfish, fearless, unorthodox preacher with the liberal ideas that produced him, this book holds up the social conception of Christianity as the only interpretation of Christianity that is worth while. . . . We do desire to express our indignation at the contemptible methods by which modernism, liberalism, rationalism — call it what you please — promotes its cause. In such stories as *The Inside of the Cup, Main Street,* and *The Church on the Avenue* conservatism is always identified with ignorance, narrowness, littleness, meanness, cruelty, and devilishness. God knows there is enough of these things among orthodox people, but orthodoxy has no monopoly of them. We know that ridicule is an effective weapon, but it is an ungenerous and unfair weapon. We cannot change things by our protest, but we can warn our people to beware of such specious arguments. Everywhere our holy religion is being attacked. We need to be on our guard. We find these covert attacks in all kinds of papers, magazines, and books. We hear them at public lectures and in halls of amusement. They are the subject of many a jest and the point of many a story. The devil is marshaling all his forces against the supernaturalism of our holy religion. That is the *crux* of the whole matter. Rob Christianity of supernaturalism, and it ceases to be a religion and becomes merely a system of ethics." MUELLER.

Obscurity and Happiness. — "The conspicuous personages in any age or society are few in number," writes the *Watchman-Examiner,* March 1, 1923. "The mass of men and women are unheard of beyond the little circle of which they form a part. Obscurity is the general lot. Often we rebel against this and wish that by some noteworthy deed we might be lifted into fame. Is this a condition to be deplored? Is it a grievous thing to be unknown? Ought we to be miserable because we are obscure? Not at all. On the contrary, happy are they whose lives are hidden from the search-light glare and the peculiar temptations and trials of publicity. What Pastor Wagner calls 'the simple life' is best for most of us, the life of humble service

and retired endeavor. And the life thus lived is very far from being a useless one. The greater part of the world's work is done by humble hands. The rough-clad oiler with his can is as necessary to the running of the train as the president in his office — more necessary, indeed, to its safe running. The ministries, the humble gifts, the right living of the obscure majority are more essential to, and more effective in, promoting the good of society than the more showy contributions of the few so-called 'prominent citizens' who are hailed as leaders of the body politic. We have no desire to minimize the value and importance of eminent talents employed for the benefit of society. But, valuable as they are, they do not, after all, constitute the chief element in promoting the progress of the world. The palms that flourish on the coral reef did not make the reef. Society is built up by the combined labor of the little units that toil unseen. The part that each contributes may be small, but it is, in its humble place, essential to the mighty whole. And God loves the humble worker, who in his simple, unpretentious way labors to promote the kingdom of Christ. How highly our Savior thought of him is shown in His surprising exclamation, 'I thank Thee, O Father, that Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and discerning and hast revealed them unto babes.' To be obscure to the world is not to be hidden from God. He who marks the sparrow's fall is not unmindful of the humblest of His sons and daughters. More precious than wisdom or wealth is the mindfulness of God. It is our joy here and our ground of hope for the hereafter. So far, then, from bemoaning the fate that places and keeps us in obscurity, let us rejoice that God permits us, in our lowly estate, to be fellow-laborers with Him and thus efficient contributors to the final consummation of Christ's kingdom. Our gifts may be small, but the hands that multiplied the loaves and fishes can multiply our offerings a thousandfold. Our words may be few and feeble, but, reinforced by the power of the Spirit, they may become words of power. Our immediate influence may not extend very far, but some who are affected by it may become Peters or Pauls in the service of the Master. No humble toiler in the kingdom of Christ should be cast down because his name and work are not more widely known. He is working for eternity, and God values his service and will make it contributory to vast and glorious results." MUELLER.

Overdoing and Underthinking. — Commenting on an assertion found in a Methodist journal to the effect that the real difficulty which besets a bishop in these days is "the temptation to overdo and underthink," the *Reformed Church Messenger* says: "It is safe to conclude that every minister is subjected to this temptation and peril. The Church has been demanding of its spiritual leaders a combination of all the gifts and virtues in one man: saintliness, statesmanship, organizing ability, administrative genius, pulpit eloquence, as well as the fine art of a successful shepherd of souls. . . . For the sake of pastor and people more opportunity should be given the minister to think and study. Everywhere that chance seems to be denied by the multiplicity of calls upon his time and strength. The minister must

insist on time to think and study both for his own soul's health and for the welfare of the people committed to his charge, of whom he must one day give account to the Chief Shepherd. Continued overdoing and underthinking is fatal." MUELLER.

Carlyle's Opinion of Charles Darwin. — "Thomas Carlyle was a great man," writes the *Lutheran Church Herald,* February 27, 1923. "He was a leading essayist and historian, whose many works are still used and loved by all thinkers. He was born in 1795 and died in 1881. Not long before his death, Carlyle, who knew Darwin well, wrote the following: 'I have known three generations of the Darwins — grandfather, father, and son — atheists all. The brother of the famous naturalist, a quiet man, who lives not far from here, told me that among his grandfather's effects he found a seal engraven with this legend *Omne Ex Conchis* (Everything from a clam-shell). I saw the naturalist not many months ago; told him that I read his *Origin of Species* and other books; that he had by no means satisfied me that we were descended from monkeys, but had gone far to persuade me that he and his so-called scientific brethren had brought the present generation very near to monkeys. A good sort of man is this Darwin and well-meaning, but with a very little intellect. It is a sad and terrible thing to see nigh a whole generation of men and women, professing to be cultivated, looking around in purblind fashion, and finding no God in the universe. I suppose it is a reaction from the reign of cant and hollow pretense, professing to believe what in fact they do not believe. And this is what we got to — all things from frog spawn — the Gospel of Dirt, that is the order of the day. The older I grow, — and now I stand on the brink of eternity, — the more comes back to me the sentence in the Catechism which I learned when a child, and the fuller and the deeper its meaning becomes: "What is the chief end of man? To glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." No Gospel of Dirt, teaching that men have descended from frogs through monkeys, can ever set that aside.' " MUELLER.

Child-Marriage and Widowhood in India. — The January number of the *Modern Review,* an Indian monthly periodical sailing under the flag of progress and reform, quotes the following from another Indian periodical called *Stri Dharma,* which name one is tempted to translate "Woman's Sphere": "The recent Madras census shows that in the Andhra District the number of child widows is increasing. Among the Kalingis, for every 1,000 children under ten years of age about 664 are married. There is an increase of 50 per cent. in the number of infant marriages and girl widows. These figures speak volumes for the failure of the work of social reformers in the Andhradesha, a country which is clamoring for political rights in the face of such a scandalous state of things. How can the God of Justice grant Home Rule to those who rule their homes so unjustly as to sentence six out of every ten girls of the tenderest years to the possibility of child-widowhood?"

The region designated by the terms "Andhradesha" and "Kalingam" coincides, roughly speaking, with the Telugu language area.

and includes the Guntur District, which was one of the first districts to attempt the final step in Mr. Gandhi's scheme of progressive non-cooperation, *viz.,* non-payment of taxes. It is to be feared that the Madras census will reveal similar conditions throughout the Madras Presidency, and that, indeed, all reformers and all reform movements in all India have made but little progress in combating this crying social evil. In the number of the *Modern Review* to which reference has been made, the editor notes with regret and despair that Dr. Gour's bill to legalize marriages contracted by persons belonging to different castes, which has been before the Legislative Council of India several times, has made no headway in the face of determined and obstinate opposition, and this in spite of the fact that, as the editor also points out, the bill is purely permissive in character, and leaves every Hindu community free to excommunicate those of its members who may offend against the law of their caste. A knowledge of facts such as these should act as a corrective of exaggerated ideas about progress in India — ideas probably traceable to the sensational manner in which a part of the American press has been "playing up" recent developments in Indian politics. Every attempt to form an estimate of the character and the condition of the average Indian from what one knows about Mr. Gandhi or about any other highly educated Indian will lead to grave errors; but still greater is the error of him who thinks he is beholding the true type of Indian womanhood in the person, say, of that fiery, eloquent poetess-patriot, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu. To this day the condition of Indian womanhood, viewed as a whole, is that which is decreed and pictured in the *Manava Dharma-sastra* (composed not later than the fifth century B. C.); and the increasing number of illustrious exceptions but serves to emphasize the somber colors in which that picture must still be painted.

In the sentences quoted the editor of *Stri Dharma* has, probably without intending to do so, pointed out the one great weakness of the Indian Nationalists' program; he has revealed the spot where this program is most vulnerable to criticism from friend and foe alike. Their program has been charged, perhaps not unjustly, with a lack of constructiveness even in the purely political sphere. But its great weakness lies elsewhere. It is to be found in this, that Indian nationalism just now thinks of all progress and reform in terms of political development. In the minds of many, reform is synonymous with the achievement of *swaraj, i. e.,* complete autonomy. That there are other kinds and forms of advancement and progress seems to have been forgotten for the time being. As some one has said, India is "politics-mad." It has been for some years. And many who have genuine sympathy with the national aspirations of India are distressed by the recklessness with which so much energy and enthusiasm is directed into this one channel, to the exclusion or, at least, grave neglect of problems which are far more pressing, and of reforms which are of vastly greater significance to the India of to-day. — The entire platform of Mr. Gandhi and his nationalist followers contains but two "planks" which can be classed under the head of social reform. One

is his war on the liquor traffic. But that is nothing new; both Mohammedanism and orthodox Hinduism teach abstinence from all intoxicants. The other is his pronouncement that "non-touchability must go," *i. e.,* that the teaching that the touch of the out-caste defiles the caste-man must be dropped, and that a place must be found for the out-caste in the fold of Hinduism. This is indeed hopeful. But, granting that Mr. Gandhi has the support of all his followers or of most of his followers in this matter, — after a long residence in India, in close contact with Hindus, one may well feel a little skeptical on this point, — the fact remains that the mere admission of the out-caste to the pale of Hinduism would not essentially change the system of caste, nor remove the disabilities, inequalities, and obstacles to real progress imposed by that system. And Mr. Gandhi has repeatedly confessed himself a believer in, and an upholder of, the institution of caste. As for those who have waited for some clear-cut, authoritative pronouncement from the Nationalists' camp regarding the improvement of the lot of Hindu women, they have waited in vain.

There are no indications that even *swaraj* would bring India escape from the trammels of caste and a bettering of the conditions in which Indian women live. Meanwhile the statement will stand unshaken that the Christian religion, working through Christian missions, has done more toward restoring to Indian womanhood its true dignity and towards improving the lot of the out-caste than any other agency — than all other agencies together, quite apart from the fact that only the message of the Christian Church brings men and women that freedom wherewith Christ has set us free.

(Communicated by Rev. H. Hamann, A. M., missionary at Ambur, North Arcot District, British India; at present on furlough in the United States.)

The Mendelian laws defining the results of cross-breeding in plants and animals are lucidly explained in the *Dearborn Independent* (February 10). These laws blasted the theories of evolutionists like Darwin, Lyell, and Lamarck, but did not offer, as had been hoped, a substitute for those theories, for they revealed even to the eye of the experimenting scientists that nature in its production work is governed by laws of unbending rigidity. This was an involuntary proof for the botanical exactness of Gen. 1, 11. 12. 21. Likewise, the geological strata with their evidences of former plant and animal life, which were presented with such plerophoric certitude to prove the theory of evolution have ceased to function in an argument for evolution; for the sequence or succession of the strata which evolutionists had presented in a rigidly fixed order — who of us does not remember the brilliant graphs in text-books of geology? — has been shown to be a mere assumption of scientists. Not only intelligent men, but the brute creatures rise in indignant protest against the "unscientific pipe-dream," as the writer, Prof. G. McR. Price of Union Pacific College, California, calls evolution. D.

Religious services controlled and paid for by the non-religious state have always seemed a curious anomaly to those who understand

the full bearing of the Constitution of the United States on the subject of state religion. In an emergency these people may have made use of government chaplaincies, because that was the only way to reach their coreligionists effectively. But government chaplaincies will always be a practical repudiation of the principle to which the citizens of our Republic stand pledged, the separation of Church and State. Besides, how foreign to the spirit of true religion and how irreverent (not to mention the inherent syncretism) have the performances of government chaplains and their treatment by the chaplains' clients occasionally been! An instance to illustrate this point has just been reported from the Legislature of Colorado, for which the chaplain, J. B. Kader, prayed: "O Lord, how long is this condition to endure? Our courts are corrupt. God has been expelled from our churches. Our pulpits are filled with essayists. Our boys and girls are going to the dogs. Laboring men go to work with empty pails, farmers starve, middlemen wax fat, banks are bursting with money." Immediately after the prayer the representatives adopted a resolution of censure, rejecting the prayer. There is reason to doubt whether this American fad of beginning any kind of public function with prayer is really to be looked upon as a religious act, and not rather as a decorous pose of virtuousness and good manners. (Not that these manners are good!) For not infrequently the loudest advocates of prayers at public functions are not at all in anything remotely resembling an odor of sanctity. D.

Ten Years of Newspaper Lying. — Under the caption "Untainted Sources of News" the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* (March 9) says editorially: —

"'Before the next war comes, if it comes, governments and nations must be convinced that lying does not pay,' reads a part of resolutions adopted at its St. Louis meeting by the Executive Committee of the Press Congress of the World. If the resolutions may seem to some to embody only a platitude, it is one that probably has been more disregarded in the last ten years than in any other similar period in the world's history, and the protest is most seasonable and perhaps the more helpful because of absurd censorship still maintained by a number of European countries. Some reserve is undoubtedly necessary during a state of war, to which state the resolutions seem by their references to be especially directed, but military secrets can generally be better guarded than by drastic censorships, which invariably are stupid. And an idea strongly emphasized is that such things as are communicated for the information of the world shall be the truth, and that the benefits of untruth designed to deceive are evanescent and quickly changed to losses.

"The principle of a free transmission and free publication of news was not arrived at without a full consciousness of the abuses and evils that often attend the principle. But it has become an accepted principle because an appraisal of generations has shown that it can result in no abuses or evils that can be compared with those resulting from a denial of the principle. This is a time when a uni-

versal resort to propaganda of infinite form causes us to suspect that the purposes back of very many things we read is not to inform the public, but to serve some *ex-parte* end. But the committee would consistently permit the unlimited distribution of propaganda, at least it would place no bureaucratic ban on its distribution that would prevent its being judged on its own merits. It is predicted that the public will learn to discriminate at least between the more plausible and the less plausible. The public has already learned a discrimination much greater than that. To let propaganda meet the fate which its own worth or lack of worth may indicate is the remedy, not official suppression. If it results in no other good, propaganda may incline to the side opposite to the one which it attempts to serve.

"Truly, as is stated, the chief concern over denials of free expression is not with journalists, but with governments, nations, peoples. At no other time have an accurate knowledge of, and an accurate interpretation on, what is afoot in all the world been more important than now."

What a fine, guarded expression of opinion this is on the part of the dear old *Globe-Democrat!* The resolution of the Executive Committee has sent the editor off in a virtuous quest of the criminal to whom the resolution may apply, and, lo! he has found him: the absurd European censors are the culprits. Remarkable discovery! And how speedily it was made! The editor also is aware of a propaganda that rouses suspicion. This fact must have dawned on the editor with the force of a revelation. — The poor, patient public which is being fed the lies of the press will now wonder what the next menu will be. Most probably more skilful lying. For while lying certainly does not pay, liars just as certainly can be paid. Let us be grateful that this happens only among stupid Europeans. *Apropos,* some unsophisticated persons believe that the trouble with our news is not so much at the sources as rather in the channels. D.

BOOK REVIEW.

The Sotarion Publishing Co., Buffalo, N. Y.: —

1. **The Selah Song Book for Worship and Devotion in Church, School, Home.** English-German edition. Compiled by *Adolf T. Hanser.* 400 pages.

892 selections from the Scriptures for antiphonal reading and hymns for use by congregations that are partly English, partly German are here offered, many of them translations that have not been published before. The music accompanies the hymns. This, as far as we know, is the only large and systematic effort that has ever been made in the American Lutheran Church to merge a bilingual congregation in the singing part of the service.

2. **The Scripture Searcher.** A new quarterly to guide Christians to follow Christ's word: "Search the Scriptures!" etc. *Rev. William Dallmann,* Editor-in-chief.

3. **The Bible Hour.** The Quarterly of the Home Service Bible Lesson.
Die Bibelstunde. German companion publication of the foregoing. Both by *Rev. Adolf T. Hanser,* Editor.

The publication edited by Rev. Dallmann presents "The Life of Paul" from close reading of the Scriptures and from the domain of archeological research. The scenes of Paul's life are dramatically described. Chiefly, however, Paul is exhibited as the great apostolic teacher of Christianity. — The publications edited by Rev. Hanser present studies of selected portions of the Gospels. D.

The American Lutheran Publicity Bureau, 289 Fourth Ave., New York City, announces three timely six-page tracts: **Christ Crucified, Sanctification,** and **Mission Work.** D.

Johannes Herrmann, Zwickau, Saxony, announces a 16-page tract by *Prof. Dr. Otto Clemm* on **Die Entstehung der Lutherbibel,** and the **Open Letter** of *Rev. Clausen,* of Todenbuettel, to the Consistory of the *Landeskirche* of Schleswig-Holstein ("Gott laesst sich nicht spotten"). D.

The Abingdon Press, New York, N. Y.: —

Hebrew Life and Times. *Harold B. Hunting.* 188 pages.

This book purposes to be a popular presentation of Jewish history and life. As far as Jewish customs as well as social and economic conditions are concerned, the book presents much that is useful and interesting. However, from a religious point of view it is practically worthless, since in this respect it is entirely governed by the views of modern higher criticism. The supernatural in Israel's history, life, and religion has been everywhere removed, and nothing is left but a bare, commonplace record of every-day happenings. Of Christ the author says: "Here, in a nutshell, is what Jesus did: He helped men to believe in a God who loved all men as His children, whether rich or poor, learned or ignorant, Jews or Gentiles or Samaritans, even the bad as well as the good; for if they were bad, they needed His love to help them to be good. Jesus not only taught this idea of God through His spoken words; He helped men, through His deeds, to understand it. He lived that way, as the Son of such a God. He healed the sick. He fed the hungry. He ate and drank with outcasts. He was everybody's Friend." This passage sufficiently characterizes the religious tenor of the book. MUELLER.

Sunday-School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, Nashville, Tenn.:—

Evolution a Menace. *J. W. Porter, D. D., LL. D.*

This is a brief, but excellent confutation of the falsehoods of evolution, written in clear, popular style. We cheerfully recommend it to all pastors whose young people are in danger of being inoculated with the virus of evolution. MUELLER.

Suomalainen Tiedeakatemian Kustantama, Helsingki: —

Die Entwickelung des Offenbarungsbegriffs seit Schleiermacher. *Dr. theol. Antti J. Pietilae.* VII and 331 pages.

This treatise by a gifted adjunct to the University of Helsingfors takes in nearly all of Vol. X, Series B, of the Annals of the Finnish Academy of Sciences. It is preceded only by a brief essay on "Ideative Coordination" by Eino Kaila. — Dr. Pietilae's effort is really a survey of the tortuous windings through which the discussion of the "problem of revelation" has passed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In a brief introductory chapter he sketches the position which was taken on the origin of the Scriptures by the Reformers (Luther and Melanchthon), the Orthodoxists (Flacius, Chemnitz, Selnecker, Aegidius Hunnius, Hafenreffer, Johann Schroeder, Leonhard Hutter, and chiefly Gerhard), the Pietists (chiefly Bengel), the Illuminists (Locke, Lessing, Spinoza, Thomasius, Semler, Behrdt, Nicolai), the Supranaturalists (Storr, Reinhardt), Kant, and Herder. The next chapter starts the treatise proper and is devoted to Schleiermacher. This is followed by a review of the mediating theologians, K. I. Nitzsch, Twesten, Rothe, Dorner, J. P. Lange, Hase, Martensen, and Schweizer. In the chapter on the "Speculative Theology" the author reviews the position of the speculative idealists, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, the speculative orthodoxists, Daub, and Marheineke, the "Hegelian Left": Strauss and Feuerbach, and the modern speculative theology of Biedermann, Pfleiderer, and Lipsius. "The Old Faith" is presented in the next chapter, under these subdivisions: Theology of Repristination: Hengstenberg, Philippi; Biblicism: Beck, Kuebel; Erlangen Theology: von Hofmann, Thomasius, von Frank; Other Neo-orthodox Theologians: Kahnis, Luthardt, von Oettingen. Chapter 6 is devoted to Ritschl and his disciples: Kaftan, Haering, Herrmann, Reischle, Wendt, Stephan. The religio-historical school of Troeltsch is discussed in the next chapter, and this is followed by a discussion of the positive *Richtung* of Kaehler, Seeberg, Ihmels, Sieffert, Girgensohn, Scharling, Brusow, and the liberal *Richtung* of Goeranson, Krarup, Ording. In a concluding chapter the author discusses the Presuppositions for a Greater Unity as regards the Revelation Issue, the Christian Certitude of Truth, the Revelation, the Bible, and Miracles. In sketching thus broadly the contents of the treatise, we have reproduced the author's own terminology, the aptness of which is, no doubt, subject to question at a number of points. *E. g.*, one may feel amused at seeing Kahnis classified as a neo-orthodox theologian. From a formal view-point the treatise is not without merit. It affords a fairly panoramic view of the author's chosen field of investigation and shows him to be very well acquainted, as a rule, with the multitude of publications that have a bearing on his subject. The student of the history of dogma can learn much from the author's arrangement of the successive stages of the Bible controversy that is the outstanding characteristic of the modern world. Moreover, Dr. Pietilae is an entertaining writer, employing a lucid style, apt phrasing, and rapid development of his argument or account. The absence of a good index for a treatise of this kind is to be regretted. — In his Preface the author expresses the fear that his treatise will be regarded as deficient in certain scientific

circles. "The spirit of Hegel is still inwrought in many minds to such an extent that men are dreaming about an inner necessity for the development of ideas, and hence demand that science must demonstrate the process of the development. However, I am not fortunate enough to be able to believe in such an inner necessity." This sounds reassuring; but the good impression is spoiled when the author proceeds: "I can only believe in the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the congregation and the Christian science of theology. There is, indeed, a development of ideas, but it does not take place *in abstracto*, not in a supersensual Platonic world, but in living personalities, who form their thoughts, from out of all the relations and influences of the time in which they live, in accordance with the peculiar character of their time and their personality. The bearers of the ideas are frequently individualistic to such an extent that they cannot be grouped according to general nomenclatures of the schools, least of all can the investigator point out their 'necessary' place in the process of development of the concept that is under investigation. Accordingly, one must be careful not to indulge in generalization and construing of history, and must stick exclusively to the final results of the mental labor, as they become distinct in the kaleidoscopic pell-mell of individual views. Thus it becomes apparent that there is in the world of religious thought after all a development and a rational — would that this term were not misunderstood! — progress; however, this is not a development of ideas by themselves, but a development of the personal religious life in the Spirit and of its reflex in science." (*NB. "deren Abspiegelung,"* we take it, should be *"dessen Abspiegelung."*) This notion pervades the entire treatise. We are actually invited to view the confusion of ideas, the war of *Richtungen* in modern scientific theology as a work of the Holy Spirit. This modern strife of theological tongues becomes virtually a twentieth century Pentecostal charisma. In every one of our modern theological geniuses the same spirit of truth is struggling for individualistic expression. If any one can believe — really believe — this, he must have a heroic faith, a faith that taxes the average intelligence far more than the "literal faith," so much derided by scientific theologians, of those who put implicit trust in the very words of Scripture. — The author is dissatisfied with the old Lutheran position on the divine revelation through the Holy Scriptures. He credits the Reformation with having achieved "the new faith": all glory for the salvation of man belongs to God alone. But he holds that this divine monergism of Luther was not sufficiently developed in Luther. Luther, he says, continued to attach an overgreat value to the medieval views of God's being and to the current ontological conclusions regarding God's essence. Luther's position is also declared to be ambiguous; he is said to have seized with remarkable courage upon "a far-reaching principle when severing what is valuable in the Scriptures from what is worthless and rejecting entire books of the Bible as unworthy of an apostle." But when fighting the internal illumination of fanatics, the artificial interpretation of Scripture by the papists, and the rationalism of Zwingli and his followers, he "lacked faith" in his liberal principle, and "could do nothing better than seek shelter in the verbally revealed doctrine. In such instances the Bible, in his view, is again an inspired book in the

old sense of the word, handed down by the church-fathers, and he will not permit an iota of Scripture to be destroyed." In Luther's sacramental teaching the author finds a magical strain because Luther speaks of a distinct grace that is conveyed by means of the Sacrament and insists on the force of the term *est*. (pp. 2—7.) Whoever has read Luther much, and with care, cannot but wince under this presentation of Luther's attitude toward the Scriptures. The subject, it must be admitted, has its difficulties; but no one who values his reputation for scholarship is warranted in ascribing to Luther even temporarily the notion that he could supersede anything that is really Scripture. Even his remarks about James and Esther do not justify such an assertion. Luther was simply impressed with the doubts that had been raised about these books ages before him, and, besides, was resisting the Roman *magisterium fidei* in what he said. It is a favorite diversion of modern writers to sketch the growing independentism of Luther somewhat like this: First, he discards the authority of the Pope by appealing to a council; next, he demands that the decision of the council must be in harmony with the Scriptures; lastly, he insists that Scripture must agree with his own faith. Dr. Pietilae does not claim that Luther assumed an attitude of superiority over the Scriptures, except for a season, but he deplores that Luther did not definitely adopt and thoroughly apply this valuable "principle." Luther would have deprecated such a "principle" with all his heart. What Dr. Pietilae has said about Luther's relation to the Scriptures is altogether shallow and superficial, and this part of his treatise deserves to be thoroughly revised. — Melanchthon fares even worse than Luther in the author's review. He faults Melanchthon for having reduced the new faith of the Reformation to a system of "*reine Lehre*" (pure teaching), and of having made the divine revelation itself a doctrine of Christianity. He repeats, with palpable regret, Seeberg's remark about Melanchthon: "He regarded it as a special mercy of God that we have the divine truth in a reliable book, and the real people of God are only where this book is accepted." He deplores the fact that through the ministry of Melanchthon "*reine Lehre*" became a constituent element of the congregation of Christ, and the Church was made *ecclesia doctrix*. (p. 9 f.) To the influence of the *Praeceptor Germaniae* the author would attribute the rigid doctrinal correctness of the age of orthodoxism. "As the Church of that age, in administering discipline for the purpose of inculcating a better religion upon souls, resorted without scruple also to the application of so-called police force, so the men of science likewise loved simple, rectilinear formulas with which to overcome recalcitrants. There they stand, those much-reviled, yet venerable theses, self-conscious and ready for battle like a phalanx of soldiers 'at attention,' just as if religion had nothing to do with profound issues of life (*Lebenstiefen*), nor with unfathomable mysteries. Orthodoxy does not easily become helpless. Questions, as, *e. g.*, those regarding the Trinity, the two natures of Christ, the operations of the Holy Spirit, and eschatology, are treated with a precision and a plenitude of knowledge which might easily be regarded as immodest arrogance by a modern person. Orthodoxy knows everything, defines everything, forces everything into its formulas, coordinates all the fulness of the world of religious experience as an object of knowledge with the objects of external experience. In

a way, orthodoxy is afraid of reason; but as soon as reason has been theologized, there are no limits to its syllogistic inferences. In the entire domain of religion orthodoxy deports itself in such fashion that the remark of the Swedish chancellor Axel Oxenstjerna regarding a Swedish bishop of hierarchical tendencies may be applied to it: 'A piece of the mantle of St. Peter has fallen on him,' — so conscious of their aim and confidently the representatives of orthodoxy pursue their way." In the preface to his *Hutterus Redivivus* Karl Hase describes the same phenomenon, viewing it, however, from an immeasurably higher ground than Dr. Pietilae. He likens the doctrinal edifice of the old orthodox Lutheran dogmaticians to the grand old Gothic cathedrals of Germany, and declares: "Our age will never produce anything like that." What gave the system of orthodox Lutherans its precision and compactness was its strict adherence to Scripture. Their system was a grand attempt to exhaust what Scripture has said on any given doctrinal subject, and to exhibit its Scriptural relationships with other doctrines. They were imbued with the conviction of the infallibility of the Bible, and that made *them* seem infallible. Fidelity to the Scriptures will produce the same type of theologians in any age — men who, in the positions which they have taken, will stand firm as a rock. The unhappy alliance with the secular power into which the Church had entered in those days produced deplorable issues. But we do not think that the modern scientific theology, which has thrived wonderfully under state protection, has any stones to cast at the orthodox age on this score. It seems as if Dr. Pietilae must have felt that he wrote a tirade when he penned the sketch of orthodoxism which has been reproduced in the foregoing. For he continues: "And yet! — there are not many epochs in the history of the Church that can bear a comparison with orthodoxy in estimating religious values, in willing self-sacrifice in behalf of liberty of conscience as then understood, and in scientific clearness and consistency. The orthodoxists had inherited a treasure from the age of the Reformation, and this treasure they were resolved to preserve undiminished and to hand it on to posterity at any price. They were concerned about the safe deposit of the contents of the faith of the Reformation, about finding an infallible source of truth, and about analyzing and systematizing all that flows from this source. While engaged upon this task, these theologians acted with such piety and honesty that Haering is unquestionably right when he says in their praise that the roots of their theory — he is speaking of their doctrine of the Scriptures — reach far down into the sanctuary of faith. The orthodox theologians, though without a hierarchy, without any common external government, knew how to unite the Protestant Church by a spiritual force, *viz.*, by the Word of God revealed in the Bible. That was a glorious achievement at a time when the very existence of the Protestant Church was at stake." How does this well-deserved encomium harmonize with the scurrilous remarks about the orthodoxists which the author makes in the preceding paragraph? Are these remarks merely the devil's sop thrown to virtue and to one's conscience? It would seem so; for he continues at once the charge which he had interrupted, by saying: "Orthodoxy has pursued the thought of a revelation of doctrine to its last consequences. While seeking for a source of truth, it could not pass by Holy Scripture. In Scripture

Luther had found the way to justifying faith. Scripture was the only staunch wall against the papists and fanatics. Scripture was the means which God Himself had provided for originating and preserving faith in the congregation. Within the confines of Scripture everything was clear and plain; outside of it men were wandering after the witcheries of the imperialistic Roman hierarchy and an imagination that spurned all discipline. The inspired Scriptures, dictated by the Holy Ghost, were the final revelation, homogeneous in all its parts, which God had entrusted to the congregation for the benefit of all who believe. The doctrine of revelation became identical with the doctrine of Holy Scripture." This attitude of orthodox Lutheranism to the Scriptures the author deplores, as he deplores likewise the old Lutheran view that the holy writers were only *causae instrumentales*, "yea, *amanuenses*," of the Holy Spirit; that there was in the act of inspiration a *dictamen Spiritus Sancti;* that in His operation upon the human mind the Spirit must not be separated from the Word, etc. In this orthodox Lutheran view, he says, the Bible became "a docetically conceived, heavenly book," which means, that the Bible of old Lutheranism was a phantastic, unreal product. — The author's remarks about Bengel breathe admiration for this scholar's work in behalf of the Bible. But the author's estimate of Bengel is built up chiefly out of the *Sixty Edifying Discourses on the Revelation of John* and J. Winkelmann's treatise *Die Offenbarung*. Bengel's *opus palmare*, the *Gnomon*, is referred to twice, and the reference is to remarks in the Preface. One of these references rests on a plain misunderstanding, to say the least. Dr. Pietilae imputes to Bengel the following view: "The Bible constitutes a finished, harmonious unit; however, being a record of the progressive economy of God, it must be historically understood." For evidence the author cites paragraphs I and III of the Preface to the *Gnomon*. Here is what Bengel says in the places cited: "I. The Word of the living God, which had governed the primitive patriarchs, was committed to writing in the age of Moses, who was followed by the other prophets. Subsequently those things which the Son of God preached, and the Paraclete spake through the apostles, were written down by the apostles and evangelists. These writings, taken together, are termed *Holy Scripture;* and bearing this title, they are themselves their own best eulogy. For it is because they contain God's words and are the Lord's Book that they are called *Holy Scripture*. 'The Word of our God,' exclaims the prophet, 'shall stand forever.' Is. 40, 8. 'Verily, I say unto you,' says the Savior Himself, 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled.' Matt. 5, 18. And again, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away.' Matt. 24, 35. The Scriptures, therefore, of the Old and New Testaments, form a most reliable and precious *system* of divine testimonies. For not only are the various writings, when considered separately, worthy of God, but they together exhibit one complete and harmonious body, unimpaired by excess or defects. They are the fountain of wisdom, which is preferred by those who have tasted it to all compositions of other men, however holy, experienced, devout, or wise. [Bengel's son Ernest here adds a note in the third edition of the *Gnomon:* "We may add: They who have not tasted it, prefer to it all compositions of mere men, however profane,

vain, wanton, or foolish. Ps. 53, 2. Hence their opposition to it."] III. Myriads of annotations were not written in the Church of the Old Testament, although the light was more scanty then, nor did learned men think that the Church of the New Testament required to be immediately laden with such helps. Every book, when first published by a prophet or an apostle, bore in itself its own interpretation, as it referred to the existing state of things. The text, which was continually in the mouths of all and diligently read by all, kept itself pure and intelligible. The saints were not busy with selecting the berries, as if the other parts were to be pruned away, nor with accumulating cumbrous commentaries. They had the SCRIPTURES. Those who were learned in the Old and New Testaments were at hand to teach the unlearned." It is simply inconceivable how Dr. Pietilae could read out of these statements the claim which he has set up that Bengel advocated the historic method of Bible interpretation. Nor does the following characterization of Bengel's interpretation come nearer to the truth: "All interpretation of Scripture must take its start from a view of the Bible as a whole (*Totalauffassung derselben*). The Bible must not be split into fragments for the purpose of using single sentences from it as proof-texts (*dicta probantia*) for the pure doctrine which has been previously fixed, but inversely we must take our start from the Bible, form a general conception of it; and not before we have done this may we say which is the true Christian doctrine." Dr. Pietilae could not have written this if he had taken the trouble to look into the *Gnomon;* for instance, into Bengel's interpretation of Christ's argument with Satan in Matt. 4, which is a veritable contest in *dicta probantia*, into Bengel's comment on "iota or tittle" in Matt. 5, 18, or on the difference between what Moses had said in the Law and what the scribes had made him say (Matt. 5), which, again, deals with the exact meaning of single Bible-texts; or on Christs' proof for immortality from a single text like Ex. 3, 6 in Matt. 22, 32; or on the point which Christ in Matt. 22, 42 ff. makes against the Pharisees from Ps. 110, 1; or on the force of Christ's remark in Luke 16, 30: "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them"; or on the Lord's answer in John 10, 35, which Bengel calls "a most firmly grounded axiom," etc., etc. — Throughout his treatise Dr. Pietilae insists on a distinction between revelation and Scripture that discounts the value of Scripture. Every sound Lutheran teacher knows this distinction and makes the proper use of it. But the proper use is not made when we say, as the author does: "I cannot but apply the name 'inspiration' to the original flaring up of the divine truth of life (*das grundlegende Aufleuchten der goettlichen Lebenswahrheit*) in the soul of a person now living and to number it with the real revelation. (Matt. 11, 25; 1 Cor. 2, 7—10.) True, there is a multitude of mediating agencies between us and the historic person of Jesus of Nazareth. There is, above all, the Bible; next, the Church with all its life, the living proclamation of the Gospel, the education which we have received, etc. All these matters approach us, to begin with, as a great manifestation of God, nor do we lack inspired interpretations of it [?]; but all this remains sealed to us until the living Spirit of God may speak His word to us. The experience that the light is *given*, which in its profoundest depths is inexplicable, must become a reality for us before we can be *certain* of our God.

The consciousness that the light was given by no means finds its sufficient explanation in the historical medium of communication (*das Bewusstsein des Gegebenseins findet in der geschichtlichen Vermittlung keineswegs seinen genuegenden Grund*). *An immediate operation of the divine Spirit must be added to the means of grace.*" (These italics ours.) (p. 311.) "The Bible itself, viewed as a whole, belongs to the original revelation. In some of its parts it consists of real monuments of the divine operation in the world, of words which have the value of facts and can be explained only as direct results of the influence of God on the bearers of the revelation. Other parts contain an original inspired interpretation of the manifestations of God and, as such, belong to the revelation proper. Furthermore, there are passages in which persons endowed with the Spirit in a general way present their personal opinions. A breath of the Spirit of revelation rests even on portions which, estimated from the view-point of the certainty of revelation, belong rather to the periphery." (p. 315.) These words, which fully characterize the author's personal attitude to the concept of revelation and to the Bible, lay before us the hopeless infatuation of modern scientific theology. It is of no avail for the author to cite texts like Matt. 11, 25 and 1 Cor. 2, 7—10 for his claim that there are revelations vouchsafed to men independently of the Word. The former text relates to what was revealed to the disciples under the tutelage of Christ, hence by the teaching of His Word, which Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum had spurned. The latter text is Paul's declaration of his and his brother apostles' inspiredness. (By the way, did not the author forget himself when he cited *dicta probantia?*) — We are confronted once more in this treatise with the appalling spiritual poverty and the overweening spiritual conceit that is typical of the scientific theology of to-day. The theory advocated by the modern theologians for explaining God's approach to men is fundamentally *Schwaermerei*. Whatever part of the divine and saving truth has entered the hearts of these men — and, God be praised! there is evidence that this has taken place — has entered by the medium of the Word, their Bible-training, etc., but not by a divine fiat flashing into their hearts without a mediating agency. Even these theologians feel the power of the Bible on their hearts, otherwise they could not, occasionally at least, speak of the Redeemer, the atonement, faith, and justification as they do. Dr. Pietilae, too, has expressed himself with remarkable clearness on these fundamentals of the faith that saves. There is in the Scriptures, as our old teachers used to say, both *inspiratio* and *respiratio:* the same truths which were conveyed to the holy writers by *inspiratio* are conveyed to the readers of their writings till the end of time by *respiratio*. The Bible is an indestructible and ever energetic deposit of divine truth and medium for begetting faith in the divine truth — even in scientific theologians. It is difficult to believe that many of these theologians really believe what they write. — We note a few of the more important errata in this treatise: p. 23, line 5, "bewahrt" should be "bewaehrt"; p. 42, l. 22, a comma should be placed after "formt"; p. 48, l. 12, "sezen" for "setzen"; p. 296, l. 21, "des" for "der"; p. 304, l. 19, "so" for "eo."

D.